

LATIN AND GREEK  
AS IN  
ROME AND ATHENS  
—  
WYNDHAM







**LATIN AND GREEK**  
**AS IN ROME AND ATHENS.**







LATIN AND GREEK  
AS IN ROME AND ATHENS,

OR,

*CLASSICAL LANGUAGES AND MODERN TONGUES.*

BY THE  
REV. FRANCIS M. WYNDHAM, M.A.

LONDON:  
EDWARD STANFORD, 55, CHARING CROSS, S.W.

—  
1880.



$\frac{1}{260}$

100.786



TO  
THE HONOURABLE FRANCIS SCOTT,

WHO, THROUGHOUT  
A LONG AND USEFUL COURSE OF PUBLIC LIFE,  
HAS EVER CHERISHED  
AN ATTACHMENT TO THE ANCIENT CLASSICS,

These Pages,  
AS A TRIBUTE OF RESPECT AND ESTEEM,  
ARE AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED.







# CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF LATIN AND GREEK .. ..	1

## CHAPTER II.

LATIN AND GREEK AS SPOKEN LANGUAGES .. .. .	12
---	----

## CHAPTER III.

GREEK, ANCIENT AND MODERN .. .. .	26
-----------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER IV.

GREEK PRONUNCIATION .. .. .	42
-----------------------------	----

## CHAPTER V.

THE ACCENTS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE .. .. .	52
---	----

## CHAPTER VI.

THE LIVING ATTRACTIONS OF GREEK .. .. .	65
---	----

## APPENDIX I.

THE ACCENTS IN GREEK VERSE .. .. .	75
------------------------------------	----

## APPENDIX II.

TABULAR VIEW OF ITALIAN AND GREEK PRONUNCIATION ..	86
--	----







# LATIN AND GREEK

## AS IN ROME AND ATHENS.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF LATIN AND GREEK.

THE substance of the following pages was written in the first instance for the benefit of those with whom I was in daily communication. The little paper presented in a concise form the principal heads of an argument in favour of treating Latin and Greek as living languages. Its extreme brevity made it hardly suitable for general readers, for whom an expansion of the subject would obviously be required, and it was therefore an agreeable surprise to find that notwithstanding its conciseness it met with some little favour. The kindly notices of several journals and the criticism of friends, whose



## 2 *Latin and Greek as in Rome and Athens.*

opinions were entitled to respect, suggested that a fuller development of the topics touched upon might prove acceptable. To this it is due that I have filled in the details of the original paper, and that I thus offer these pages to the notice of the public.

From a scientific point of view, the question as to what were the sounds with which the classical languages were anciently invested engages the attention of the scholar and philologist. But besides this there is a wider and an essentially practical question. Latin and Greek may be treated as languages to be read and written, and to be represented to our ears in the sounds of our own language. On the other hand, they may be studied with all due rigour and accuracy, and at the same time be dealt with as languages available as a means of spoken communication with others, whether of our own land or of foreign countries. They may also be kindled into life and receive fresh powers of attraction by being clothed with the living sounds of those speeches which are descended most directly from the ancient languages themselves.

These are questions having a direct and a practical bearing upon education, and carry with



them from this very fact an interest of far wider range than a purely philological discussion. It was from a sense of the general importance of the subject that I ventured to forward a copy of the little paper to one of the most eminent of living scholars,\* who ever shows a warm interest in matters affecting education. The words with which he did me the honour to reply will be read with the attention and respect that the source whence they emanate will justly command:—

“SIR,—I thank you for your very clear and interesting tract. In the difficult matter to which it refers the one thing most clear appears to be that our present methods are wrong. I agree with you as to the case of Latin and Italian. As to Greek, I have these difficulties:

“1. It would be very hard to work together two systems so different as those of the Italians and the modern Greeks.

“2. I feel convinced that what the accents are meant to represent was (mainly) pitch, and consequently that the Greeks are wrong in supposing them to mean *ictus* or emphasis.

\* Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.



#### 4 *Latin and Greek as in Rome and Athens.*

“ 3. I can hardly believe that the old Greeks gave the same sound to six separate written vowel expressions.

“ Your very faithful

“ W. E. GLADSTONE.

“ *August 30, 1879.*”

It is almost impossible that there should exist a scheme for higher education in which the study of language and literature should not hold a prominent position. They are so intimately connected with the working of the mind, that they are by their very nature fitted for the training and cultivation of the intellectual faculties. Language is the image of the mind itself, and the outward expression of its thoughts. Literature shows by way of example the working of the minds of men, and is as it were a series of pictures illustrating all that is beautiful in imagination and graceful in expression. It stores the mind with ideas, and cultivates its taste and discrimination in the selection of words wherewith to clothe its thoughts; while at the same time it influences the moral qualities by putting forward that which is noble and good to be followed. The ancients gave the compositions



of good poets to boys to learn by heart, in order that by emulation they might imitate the good which they read of, and strive to be good themselves.\*

From literature also a wide knowledge is gained of human nature; and few things are more important to one making his way through the world than that knowledge of man in others and in oneself which, combined with high principles, enables a person to comport himself rightly and courteously in his intercourse with others. "Man is to be trained chiefly by studying and by knowing man; and we are prepared for knowing man in life by learning him first in books, much as we are taught to draw from drawings, before we draw from nature. But if man is to be studied in books, he will best be studied in such books as present him to us in the largest, strongest, simplest, in a word, the most typical forms. These forms are principally found among the ancients. Nor can the study of the ancients be dissociated from the study of their languages. There is a profound relation between thought and the investiture which it chooses for itself; and it is, as a general rule,

\* Plato, *Pythag.* 43.



## 6 *Latin and Greek as in Rome and Athens.*

most true, that we cannot know men or nations unless we know their tongue." \*

From amongst the various languages of the world, Latin and Greek have been unanimously chosen—or rather have naturally taken their place—as the great educational instruments. It is in this capacity in the first place, as well as leading to direct and tangible results, that they are so highly esteemed. Other studies may be more easy to gauge at their value in money as bringing in a definite return for what has been expended upon them. But few, if any, are so well calculated to train the mind to the full exercise of its faculties. He who has his intellect so developed that he can apply himself to whatever may be required of him, is a more useful man than the one who, with a head stocked with knowledge, has a mind untrained in the use of its powers.

Those who are the most busied with the affairs of practical life, are often the foremost to vindicate this truth.

"I would make war," says Mr. Goschen, "on ignorance as much as any one; but in the

\* Inaugural Address on the Work of Universities, April 16, 1860, by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. 'Gleanings of Past Years.' London, 1879, vol. vii. p. 23.



pursuit of useful, saleable, and available knowledge, let it be remembered that education is not simply the acquisition of knowledge, but the fashioning and preparing of all the mental faculties for the various duties those faculties will be called upon to perform.” \*

It may be asked however wherein, more particularly, lies the peculiar value of Latin and Greek, considered apart from their literature, as educators of the mind. Might not our own language, or that of any other European nation, be chosen to play the part that is given to Latin and Greek?

Modern languages can, in one sense, never fill the place of the ancient ones. Latin, for instance, is the parent: French, Italian, Spanish—in a word, the Romance languages—are the descendants. In each one of these taken separately we see reflected in various ways the form and character of the common ancestor. But the characteristics are gathered together and centred in the original itself. From this they branch off; and while Latin will perhaps not be fully appreciated till an acquaintance with the

\* Right Hon. G. J. Goschen, M.P., Address to the Students of University College, Bristol. The ‘Times,’ January 16, 1879.



## 8 *Latin and Greek as in Rome and Athens.*

languages sprung from it have thrown back their light upon itself, they in their turn cannot be thoroughly studied without a knowledge of the tongue from which they were each one derived. As is remarked by an able Review, those who have "laid the best foundation in a mastery of the ancient languages of Europe are likely, *cæteris paribus*, soonest and most thoroughly to perfect themselves in a knowledge of the later tongues which have grown out of them." \*

Again, there is nothing more interesting, I will not say to the scholar alone, but to every educated person, than the connection between one language and another, and the records of customs and history of the past that words and names of places contain in themselves. But the study of comparative languages cannot go far without a knowledge of Latin and Greek: reference will be continually made to the first and will again be extended to Greek.

An intellectual character is sometimes attributed to the classical languages on account of a difficulty of attainment they often present. Yet while it is true that reflection and thought are of

\* "The Head Masters on Latin and Greek." 'Saturday Review,' December 27, 1879.



the highest importance, these are not necessarily incompatible with greater ease and familiarity than is usually experienced. The mere difficulty of learning what is termed a *dead* language, or the classing it as such, does not appear sufficiently to account for the intellectual character of Latin and Greek. If they had continued to exist in precisely the same form in which they anciently flourished, would it have been necessary to seek for some language that had passed out of use?

A practical answer may be given from the case of the Greeks of to-day. They carry on the study of Greek with a care and precision equal to our own. The grammars which they learn are grammars not of modern but of ancient Greek; and the authors to which they devote their attention are those of the classical times. They have therefore before them, as the subject of their study, the language as it belongs to a certain fixed and definite period, the grammar of which has been reduced to scientific system and rule.

The Greek and Latin languages at the classical stages of their existence are stereotyped as the common property of the whole civilized world. The meaning of their words has been determined;



they are not liable to fluctuation or change. The structure of their sentences has been commented upon and explained by learned men of all nations. In short, the aggregate learning and scholarship of every age and country have been expended upon them. There is an universal consent as to all that belongs to the grammar and syntax of these languages. They can be taught therefore with an authority that attaches to no other language, and with a precision and an accuracy that remove their study from the domain of current and variable custom, and stamp it with a distinctly intellectual character.

It is quite possible to conceive that a modern language, with equal merits as a language and as the depositary of a literature, should take the place of Latin and Greek. It is quite another question whether this could actually come to pass. To obtain for a language universal acceptance as one of wide-world learning and scholarship, to determine upon that period of the language and of its literature which should be accounted the standard, is not the work of a moment or of any one people. The present state of the grammatical analysis of the Greek language, dating from Aristophanes the



Grammarians, is the result of the work of about twenty-one centuries. It is not that the mere antiquity of Greek has obtained for it its intellectual position; but its antiquity has given time for the learning of ages to accumulate, and for the intellect of the world to perfect what pertains to its study.

The day may be far off when another tongue shall be found to take the place of classical Greek, or to supplant the ancient speech of the Romans. The two languages share between them the honour of being the universal representatives of the beauties of literature and the wide-world exponents of grammatical science.



## CHAPTER II.

## LATIN AND GREEK AS SPOKEN LANGUAGES.

GREAT, however, as is the value of Latin and Greek, it must be confessed that they do not always meet with the appreciation they justly deserve. There are not only subjects of a different kind which claim their due share of attention, and are sometimes more engrossing from their practical nature, but there are also languages that present wide inducements to their study, and carry with them advantages obvious to all. To the traveller a knowledge of the speech of the people through whose country he passes, adds at once to the pleasure of his journey. The beauties of scenery, the fine arts, the historical associations of places of note, have each one their influence in promoting travel. But there is nothing more full of interest to one wandering from his own land than the friendly communication and intercourse with people of various customs and nationalities. The power to converse with them in their own tongue gives an insight into their



habits and character which no interpreter could possibly supply.

Fifty years ago those who crossed the Straits of Dover were comparatively few; but now, from the facilities of moving quickly from place to place, the prospect of visiting foreign countries is one which almost every one may expect to see realized. Modern languages have thus an interest not only from the fact that they are spoken, but also because a knowledge of them may at any moment be turned to practical account.

It is far different with Latin and Greek. Whatever advances have been made in the practice of oral teaching, it still remains a fact that with us they are commonly regarded as languages seldom or never to be spoken. The average schoolboy looks upon them as the curious remains of a bygone age. They may be eminently suitable for inscriptions upon public monuments or for expressing grandiloquent phrases by means of an ingenious concatenation of words. That Cicero and Demosthenes should have spoken and written as they did causes him no wonder or surprise. But that Latin and Greek should be the means of ordinary intercourse upon matters of every-day life is an idea



that seldom occurs. It is as though they had never been the common speech of a people at large, but had only been paraded in state upon solemn occasions. The young student is acquainted with them only in books. They lie speechless before him on paper. They exist to him abstracted from real life and belonging to a silent world of their own. They appear to have no relation to things of the present, and in consequence are held to be tedious and dull.

There will be exceptions to this as to everything else. Many of quick perceptions and bright talents will look forward beyond the difficulties and toil that they meet with at first, and will be led on by the prospects of ultimate gain. Yet with the greater number the irksomeness of the present will outweigh the benefits to be reaped in the future; and the more undeveloped the mind the less is it drawn by what appeals to neither the eye nor the ear. A language which is scarcely heard except in translating from books, presents but slender capabilities of attracting the young. It has an unreality about it if never used as an ordinary expression of thought. For the idea of *speaking* is inseparably bound up with language. It is γλῶσσα,



*lingua, lengua, sprache, speech* or *tongue*. It is either *that which is spoken*, or it receives the appellation of the chief organ *producing* it. If therefore we sever from a language the principal idea connected with it, we at once detract from its power to interest, and we go far towards characterizing the language itself as an anomaly.

The very sounds of the voice have an influence in arresting attention which books, whatever their merits, cannot command. The whole history of the world is a testimony to this. The charm of *spoken* language is shown not only by the study and practice of public speaking in ancient Athens and Rome, but by the readiness, even eagerness, with which the words of an able speaker are at any time listened to. It is not merely the subject that attracts, but the living voice by which the ideas are conveyed. "The type is a poor substitute for the human voice. It has no means of arousing, moderating, and adjusting the attention. It has no emphasis except Italics, and this meagre notation cannot finely graduate itself to the need of the occasion. It cannot in this way mark the heed which should be specially and chiefly given to peculiar passages or words. It has no variety of



manner and intonation, to show by their changes how the words are to be accepted, or what comparative importance is to be attached to them. It has no natural music to take the ear, like the human voice." This elegant panegyric of an Oxford Professor\* upon the influence which eloquence can exert over an audience is but another witness to the interest which the human voice imparts to a subject.

Surely, then, our dumb classical tongues might profitably be encouraged to speak. On the Continent—and that not only in Italy, France, or Spain, but even amongst Teutonic nations—Latin, at least, is spoken to a degree that is unknown in England, and a familiarity with the language is gained that we do not usually acquire. In Continental schools, writes Canon Farrar, "I have not only heard boys converse in Latin with perfect fluency—an accomplishment in which even our best scholars are needlessly deficient—but even turn into good classical Latin long German sentences, which would have surpassed the powers of English

\* Quoted by Cardinal Newman. 'The Office and Work of Universities,' by John Henry Newman, D.D., of the Oratory. London, 1856, p. 279.



boys far older than themselves.”\* The practice as regards Greek, a language more flexible and better adapted to the ease of a colloquial style, has been for years successfully carried out in Edinburgh under the auspices of Professor Blackie.† Translation we have under various forms; but to speak a language is not simply to translate into it, and something more is required than even the *vivâ voce* rendering of phrases from a book. Translation is the substitution for words in one language of words in another: speaking is the expression of thought, at once, in the language required. It comes direct from the mind and has a character of life which translation does not possess. It does not depend for its effect upon a large vocabulary; a few simple words will suffice for a beginning. Some homely ideas put into words without a book or previous preparation will give a living reality to a language which many hours of construing will fail to convey. The beginner, however young, will

\* ‘Essays on a Liberal Education.’ Essay V. London, 1868, p. 220.

† See ‘*Horæ Hellenicæ*,’ London, 1874; ‘*Colloquia Græca*,’ London and New York, 1875, by John Stuart Blackie, F.R.S.E., Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh; also an article by the same author in ‘*Contemporary Review*,’ March, 1879.



readily see that the language is like his own—a means for the expression of ideas, and will be allured, not repelled, by its study.

It may seem to be of small importance to consult the likes and dislikes of the young. Yet are not the youth of to-day the scholars of the future? Many a one may feel, even against his will, an aversion to classical studies from the impression of weariness they caused him in boyhood. And many a boy may owe in the future the advantages that are to be reaped from Latin and Greek to the life and external associations with which they were surrounded.

But besides the speechlessness to which Latin and Greek, with us, are condemned, there is a further disadvantage under which they labour. When indeed they open their lips it is to give utterance to sounds which no one can imagine to have ever belonged to them. They are thus neither invested with a personality of their own, nor do they point by a family likeness to speeches that are sprung from themselves. They suggest no comparison with other languages, they point to no past, they lead to no future. They are intelligible only to ourselves



and they shock and offend the ears of strangers. "Spare a foreigner's ear," says Dr. Wagner, "the pangs inevitably consequent upon hearing an Englishman pronounce Greek!"\* The same may surely be said of Latin, unless, as may be hoped, the Syllabus of the Oxford and Cambridge Professors of Latin has worked more reformation than is outwardly apparent. For what Continental scholar could hear us talk Latin without being wonder-struck at the sounds by which we have rendered a southern speech and an universal language a northern barbarity and an isolated jargon? Surely when Queen Elizabeth spoke Latin to the Ambassadors at the Court of St. James's it was in some sweeter accents than those of English Latin of to-day! The speech of those learning Latin, wrote Milton, "is to be fashioned to a distinct and clear pronunciation, as near as may be to the Italian, especially in the vowels. For we Englishmen, being far Northerly, do not open our mouths in the cold air wide enough to grace a Southern tongue; but are observed by all other nations to speak exceeding close and inward; so that to smatter Latin with an

\* 'Trans. Philolog. Soc.,' 1874.



English mouth is as ill a hearing as law French." \*

Every language as spoken has a distinctive character of its own. Just as countries have their national costumes so have languages their peculiarities of sound. The English peasant would look strange arrayed as a Spanish muleteer, and in like manner what suits one speech is seldom becoming to another. Take a French book and read it as English, and let any one who hears it say whether the effect is not something too monstrous to bear repetition. And when we thus deal with Latin and Greek we strip them of that which would give them freshness and life and we consign them to the regions of death. What wonder then, when we have declared them to be dead, that others should be anxious to bury them!

"What then can we practically do to put new life into the study of Greek and Latin and to make it a real interest to average students, instead of a dry and irksome discipline?" † We can invest them with the living pronunciation

\* "Of Education; to Master Samuel Hartlib." Prose Works of John Milton, edited by Charles Symmons, D.D. London, 1806, vol. i. p. 277.

† "The Study of Greek," 'Saturday Review,' January 11, 1879.



of those people who are the heirs of the ancient Greeks and Romans themselves. The Italians, inhabiting the land of Latin and descended from the ancient lords of the soil, are the natural representatives of the Romans of old. Latin has been gradually moulded into Italian, which has taken the place of its parent tongue as the vernacular speech of the country. Nevertheless, Latin is not merely read but also spoken fluently by numbers of educated Italians. So much is this the case that it may be said never to have died out, but to have remained in continual and unbroken existence as a spoken language to the present day. A stranger may find himself addressed in Latin without hesitation or apology, this language being presumed, amongst educated people, to be at once a ready means of communication between persons of different speech.

It may readily be granted that Latin as spoken by the Italians is not in all respects the same as Latin spoken by Cæsar or Cicero. Yet the fact that Spanish, Italian, Romouni, and even the Romansch of the Grisons resemble one another in their general characteristics of sound makes it probable that in this respect they more



or less nearly approach to the ancient language of Rome. We may examine the value of various letters by the light of such documents and evidence as are possessed.\* But could we in the case of Italian or Spanish, if there existed no living example, reproduce not simply the separate values of letters but the living varieties of sound and intonation that give those speeches a charm and a grace? We afford a stranger but a faint idea of the character of a language when we place before him a table of equivalents of letters. He will naturally turn from the description on paper and ask for the living language itself. When a language passes from the abstract to the concrete, and assumes a living personality and form, it at once acquires a power to awaken attention to itself which it previously did not possess.

The form that will be generally considered most natural to Latin is that, I believe, with which it is invested in Italy. Certainly to hear Latin spoken by an Italian of culture and refinement is a pleasure which few persons could

\* 'Grammar of the Latin Language,' by H. J. Roby, M.A. London, 1876. 'An Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology,' by John Peile, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Christ's College. London, 1875.



fail to enjoy. What had been, as with us, a language of books falls upon the ear in melodious tones expressive of every shade and variety of meaning. It seems as though one who by his writings had become familiar as an old and valued friend was present before us, and was delighting us with the sounds of his living voice. If then we would give a freshness and a life to Latin, and stimulate an interest in it that will relieve the dryness of the severer mental discipline, we shall do well to assimilate our speech to that of Rome of to-day. Even Italian is considered to be uttered in perfection by the lips of the Roman: "*Lingua Toscana in bocca Romana.*"

There will still remain open the philological question of how far the present Italian varies in sound from that of the classical Latin. For to turn from a pronunciation which stamps a language as dead, and to adopt one that gives it life and is probably the most congenial to the language itself, is in no way to determine or prejudice questions that are open to doubt or to variety of opinion. If, as some think, the day may come when civilized nations will agree upon one common pronunciation of Latin, we shall be in no



ill condition through having ourselves a mode of speech widely intelligible. We have at present a "solitary and barbarous method of pronouncing both the Greek and Latin languages. In this one respect the European world may still in justice describe the English at least as the *penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos*."\* But Latin as spoken by the Italian is probably more generally intelligible than Latin spoken after any other manner.

From this also it would follow that Latin would be put directly forward as the parent of one of its descendants. As usually acquired in England it is placed in connection with no other language; but learnt with the southern pronunciation it would at once be a help to the acquisition of Italian. This would gain by having a guide pointing directly towards it, and Latin would be more highly appreciated through leading to practical results. An Irish gentleman residing at Palestrina, the "cool Præneste" of Horace, thus tersely expressed to some acquaintances there what had been to him the value of Latin: "You have raised your

\* 'Studies on Homer,' by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., LL.D. Oxford, 1858, vol. i. p. 92.



Palestrina upon the foundation of the ancient Præneste, and I have built up Italian upon my early knowledge of Latin." Spanish and Portuguese would likewise share in the benefit; and the traveller in the Upper Valley of the Inn, or through Wallachia—the ancient Dacia of the Romans—would probably find the southern melody of his Latin more serviceable than the Anglicized speech to which we are mostly accustomed.

As in most things so in language, Nature herself has wonderfully contrived that what has the most dignity and the greatest beauty shall carry with it at the same time the fullest utility.\*

\* Cicero de Oratore, iii. 45.



## CHAPTER III.

## GREEK, ANCIENT AND MODERN.

A WIDER acquaintance with different languages follows as a natural consequence of increased communication with various countries. Yet of European speeches one has lain almost hidden from sight. From its antiquity it was perhaps considered as entitled to be dead, and the popular notion usually entertained was that many years ago it had altogether expired. It was necessarily understood that the people of Greece were not without a language of their own, but the fact has not been extensively realized that this language is Greek.

The deeds of the Greeks before Troy were sung of by Homer nearly three thousand years ago. Our own literature dates back only some four or five centuries, while just so many before the Christian era that of Greece was at the height of its splendour. Yet even now it lives. And the native tongue of Æschylus,\* Aris-

\* Born B.C. 525.



tophanes,\* Xenophon,† Demosthenes,‡ Plato,§ and Aristotle,|| is still the speech of the people of Greece. “Greek,” as a learned scholar of Cambridge remarks, “has lived on from the days before Homer into our own, one and the same language always, in spite of small changes,—still giving new proofs of its flexibility in the ease with which it finds terse expressions for modern ideas.”¶ Professor Blackie, after returning from a visit to Greece, thus addressed the Professors and students of the University of Edinburgh: “In the first place I have to assert as a philological fact that there is not the slightest foundation for the notion commonly entertained that the language now spoken by educated Greeks is a different language from that spoken in the days of Pericles or Demosthenes.” \*\*

A language, however, does not remain stationary, still less can it through a long course of time escape modification and change. And

\* Born *circa* B.C. 444.

† Born *circa* B.C. 444.

‡ Born B.C. 382–381.

§ Born B.C. 429.

|| Born B.C. 384.

¶ ‘Primer of Greek Literature,’ by R. C. Jebb, M.A., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. London, 1877.

\*\* ‘On the Living Language of the Greeks and its utility to the Classical Scholar.’ Edinburgh, 1853, p. 8.



Greek has not been an exception to the general rule. But no other European language has undergone such small changes compared with its age.\* Yet we must not expect to find the mass of the people talking classical Greek. At the same time, if their speech is not exactly after the manner of the ancient writings, we must not conclude that it is not Greek that they talk. There is in every country some difference between the language of books and that commonly spoken by the people at large. Making due allowance for the fact that authors wrote with the view to their productions being spoken rather than read, it is the *literary* language of Greece that for the most part has come down to us. Next, Xenophon did not write precisely like Homer, and Plutarch and Lucian differ from Xenophon. Yet Greek was the language of each of them. And in like manner, though the speech of to-day varies from the classical writings, there is one fact that clearly asserts itself and that is that the language is Greek.†

\* "Greek and Arabic seem to be the two spoken languages that have suffered the smallest change in the lapse of ages." Finlay, 'History of Greece,' iv. p. 5.

† Modern Greek "with its inflexions correctly written might easily be mistaken for a colloquial dialect of some ancient



A Greek newspaper or book published in Athens to-day is intelligible without a previous knowledge of modern Greek. And one cannot take up a book of travels in Greece without recognizing as old friends the words which make up the scraps of conversation quoted here and there from the lips of the natives. "All this magnificent scenery," writes Sir Thomas Wyse describing a tour in Eubœa, "drew frequent exclamations of admiration from our one gendarme, who tripped lightly on before us on foot crying out Περιβολή τοῦ θεοῦ! ἔκαμε ἀληθῶς ὁ θεὸς ὄχι ἄνθρωπος!—θαυμάζον!\*—and much else reminding one of Cowper's

"God made the country, and man made the town."†

---

Greek colony, were it possible for a scholar unacquainted with the existence of the nation in modern times to meet with a Romaic translation of Thucydides. There is hardly more difference between the language of Homer and the New Testament, than between that of the New Testament and a modern Greek review." 'A History of Greece,' by George Finlay, LL.D., edited by the Rev. H. F. Tozer, M.A., &c. Oxford, 1877, vol. iv. p. 5.

\* "Garden (περιβολή literally an "enclosure," Herodotus, iv. 78) of God!—truly God made it not man!—admire it!" ἔκαμε. κάμνω is the word now used for to *do*, to *make*. cf. Homer Il. ii. 101, ἔστη σκῆπτρον ἔχων, τὸ μὲν Ἡφαιστος κάμε τεύχων.

† 'Impressions of Greece,' by the Right Hon. Sir Thomas Wyse, K.C.B., late Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at Athens. London, 1871, p. 214.



Many Turkish and Italian words had, it is true, crept into use; but they had settled down amongst the other words as intruders and had not become a necessary part of the language. Thus, when towards the end of the last century a movement was made in favour of purifying the language of foreign expressions the work was quickly effected. Ancient words where they had not become obsolete took the place of borrowed ones now set aside, and new words—when necessary—were coined out of the abundant resources of the Greek language itself. If the fact of reforms having been needed shows that corruptions had come in, the ease with which the changes were made according to classical type is an evidence of the essential identity of the language at the ancient and present stages of its existence.

It is only natural to expect that the less educated portion of the people should have been the slowest to be affected by these reforms. Yet even they have not been uninfluenced. “At the present time, a little girl in the street, if you ask for a flower by the Albanian word λουλούδι, may surprise you by saying that you



must say *ἄνθος*; and if you wish a boat to shoot across from the Piræus to Ægina, you may find that you have to ask in Thucydidean phrase for a *λέμβος*, and not for a *barchetta*.\* Sir Thomas Wyse, who as British Minister at Athens for nearly thirteen years (up to April 1862) had ample opportunity of observing these changes, on visiting a school in Bœotia incidentally touches upon this point: "The practice of grammar is constant in every school throughout the country, and its effects are already seen amongst the people. Dialects are somewhat preserved, but foreign words are disappearing—Turkish first, and then Italian."†

‘The Modern Greek Language’‡ by Mr. Geldart, and the newly-published ‘Handbook of Modern Greek’§ by Messrs. Edgar Vincent and T. G. Dickson, will afford copious information upon the language as spoken at present. And

\* ‘*Horæ Hellenicæ*,’ pp. 160, 161.

† ‘*Impressions of Greece*,’ p. 102.

‡ ‘*The Modern Greek Language in its relation to Ancient Greek*,’ by E. M. Geldart, B.A., formerly Scholar of Balliol, &c. Oxford, 1870.

§ ‘*A Handbook to Modern Greek*,’ by Edgar Vincent, Coldstream Guards, and T. G. Dickson, with a preface by Professor J. S. Blackie. London, 1879.



Professor Blackie's article on the "Philological Character of the Modern Greek Language" \* is especially useful as giving briefly the chief points of difference between modern and ancient Greek. But some examples may be acceptable in these pages and the following may serve for the purposes of general comparison. A specimen from the New Testament will be interesting to most readers,—the more so as the language of to-day bears a greater resemblance to the Greek of the New Testament and that of the Septuagint than perhaps to any other writings of equal antiquity. In the case of the Septuagint Mr. Geldart considers this likeness to be due to the Alexandrian translators' having made use of the current vernacular as being more familiar to the generality of readers than a studied composition after the Attic model.†

The modern Greek version of the following passage from the Acts of the Apostles, chap. v.

\* Art. III. in 'Horæ Hellenicæ.'

† "The phraseology of the Septuagint is modern to an extent which is quite marvellous, when compared with that of contemporary writers, and only explicable by the assumption that the writers are using the common vernacular, which had already become in its spirit and essence much what modern Greek now is." 'The Modern Greek Language,' p. 102.



is that of the late Professor Neophytos Bambas.

ORIGINAL.

MODERN VERSION.

22. οἱ δὲ ὑπηρέται παραγε-  
νόμενοι οὐχ εὗρον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ  
φυλακῇ· ἀναστρέψαντες δὲ ἀπήγ-  
γειλαν,

22. οἱ δὲ ὑπηρέται ἐλθόντες  
δὲν εὗρον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ  
φυλακῇ· καὶ ἐπεστρέψαντες  
ἀπήγγειλαν,

23. λέγοντες, “Ὅτι τὸ μὲν δεσ-  
μωτήριον εὗρομεν κεκλεισμένον  
ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ, καὶ τοὺς  
φύλακας ἔξω ἐστῶτας πρὸ τῶν  
θυρῶν· ἀνοίξαντες δὲ, ἔσω οὐδένα  
εὗρομεν.”

23. λέγοντες, “Ὅτι τὸ μὲν δεσ-  
μωτήριον εὗρομεν κεκλεισμένον  
μετὰ πάσης ἀσφαλείας, καὶ τοὺς  
φύλακας ἱσταμένους ἔξω ἔμ-  
προσθεν τῶν θυρῶν· ἀνοίξαντες  
δὲ, οὐδένα εὗρομεν ἔσω.

24. Ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν τοὺς λόγους  
τούτους ὁ τε ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ στρα-  
τηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς,  
διηπόρουν περὶ αὐτῶν, τί ἂν  
γένοιτο τοῦτο.

24. ὥς δὲ ἤκουσαν τοὺς λόγους  
τούτους καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ στρα-  
τηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς,  
ἦσαν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ περὶ αὐτῶν, εἰς  
τί ἔμελλε νὰ καταντήσῃ τοῦτο.

25. παραγενόμενος δέ τις ἀπήγ-  
γειλεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, “Ὅτι ἰδού  
οἱ ἄνδρες οὓς ἔθεσθε ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ,  
εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐστῶτες καὶ  
διδάσκοντες τὸν λαόν.”

25. καὶ ἐλθὼν τις ἀπήγγειλε  
πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων, “Ὅτι ἰδού οἱ  
ἄνθρωποι τοὺς ὁποίους ἐβάλετε  
εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν, ἱστανται ἐν τῷ  
ἱερῷ καὶ διδάσκουσι τὸν λαόν.

An opportunity of comparing the present language with Attic Greek of the best period has recently been afforded by Professor Jebb, who has published the Third Book of Xenophon's *Anabasis*\* with a Modern Greek Version, by the

\* ‘The *Anabasis* of Xenophon, Book III. with the Modern Greek Version of Constantine Bardolachos, and a Prefatory Note by R. C. Jebb, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow.’ Glasgow, 1879.



late Constantine Bardolachos, from a scarce copy in the possession of my friend Professor Michael Constantinides. The original and the modern version are printed, on pages facing one another, in such a manner that throughout the whole book the two versions run side by side in parallel sections. The following short extract (III. i. 4.) may suffice as a specimen.

## ORIGINAL.

Ἦν δέ τις ἐν τῇ στρατιᾷ  
Ξενοφῶν Ἀθηναῖος, ὅς οὔτε  
στρατηγὸς οὔτε λοχαγὸς  
οὔτε στρατιώτης ὢν συνη-  
κολούθει, ἀλλὰ Πρόξενος  
αὐτὸν μετεπέμψατο οἴκοθεν,  
ξένος ὢν ἀρχαῖος· ὑπισχνεῖ-  
το δὲ αὐτόν, εἰ ἔλθοι, φίλον  
Κύρῳ ποιήσκειν· ὃν αὐτὸς  
ἔφη κρείττω ἑαυτῷ νομίζειν  
τῆς πατρίδος.

## MODERN VERSION.

Ἦτο δέ τις εἰς τὸν στρατὸν  
ΞΕΝΟΦΩΝ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ, ὅστις,  
οὔτε στρατηγὸς, οὔτε λοχαγὸς,  
οὔτε στρατιώτης ὢν, συνηκολού-  
θει· ἀλλ' ὁ Πρόξενος τὸν προσ-  
εκάλεσεν ἀπὸ τὰς Ἀθήνας, διότι  
ἦτο παλαιὸς τοῦ φίλος· τὸν  
ὑπέσχετο δὲ, ἐὰν ἔλθῃ, νὰ τὸν  
κάμῃ φίλον τοῦ Κύρου, τὸν  
ὁποῖον αὐτὸς ἔλεγεν, ὅτι νομίζει  
διὰ τὸν ἑαυτὸν τοῦ ὠφελιμώτερον  
τῆς πατρίδος.

When ancient and modern Greek are thus placed side by side, the fact that lies most plainly upon the surface is that the modern language occupies more space than the ancient. In order that the two may be presented simultaneously to the eye of the reader the modern



version must be printed in smaller type than the ancient. This illustrates the tendency, observable in the history of languages, to split up a word containing much meaning within itself into two or more words expressive of the same sense. Languages, if they thus make their meaning more unmistakably clear, at the same time become less concise. What is pressed together in their *synthetical* state, they unfold in their *analytical* form. Thus modern Greek makes use of auxiliary verbs, (ἔχω and θέλω), and for the future tense requires, like English, more than one word; λύσω, *I shall loose*, becomes θέλω λύσει in the present language.\*

This again is incidentally illustrated in the following passage: "Our next visit was to the Hellenic school.† The pupils were reading when I entered from the usual Chrestomathia, or selections, 'The Dream of Lucian.' The exercises consisted in translating; one might almost say paraphrasing, it into modern Greek; little more than loosening the ranks, and diluting the compactness of the ancient into the feebleness of the modern."‡ The following sentences from a

\* See also 'A Brief Greek Syntax,' by Rev. F. W. Farrar, M.A., F.R.S., &c., London, 1867, p. 2.

† At Livadia.

‡ 'Impressions of Greece,' p. 106.



grammar for the use of Hellenic schools\* will further exemplify the above remarks. They are taken from exercises consisting of ancient Greek to be “paraphrased” into modern, and of modern to be rendered into ancient.

Ἀρχαῖον (ancient).

ὁ παῖς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐγγράφει.—Οἱ πολέμιοι πρέσβεις εἰς πόλιν ἔπεμψαν.—οἶνος καὶ τὰ κεκρυμμένα φαίνει.

Ἀπλοῦν (modern).

ἡ ἐπιστολὴ εἶνε γραμμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδίου.—ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐπέμφθησαν πρέσβεις εἰς τὴν πόλιν.—πολλάκις δεικνύει ὁ οἶνος ὅ, τι ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἔχει κρυμμένον εἰς τὴν καρδίαν.†

The last example is of a purely modern character, being the announcement of an “arrival” by an Athenian newspaper. It is not in such paragraphs that one would look for classical words and expressions. Yet, if that which is peculiar to modern times be excepted, there is not amongst these few words one which may not be found in Liddell and Scott’s *Lexicon*. The compound ἀτμόπλοιον will naturally not appear, but there were *boats* (πλοῖον) and *steam* (ἀτμός) in the days of the Heroes.

\* Γραμματικὴ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης πρὸς χρῆσιν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν σχολείων, by Antonios I. Antoniadēs. Athens, 1878.

† Ibid. p. 144.



Ἀθήνησι τῇ 3 Δεκεμβρίου 1876.

Ἀφίκετο χθὲς διὰ τοῦ ἀτμοπλοίου τῶν Γαλλικῶν διαπορθμεύσεων ὁ πρωτότοκος υἱὸς τοῦ ἀ' γραμματέως τῆς ἐνταῦθα ἀγγλικῆς πρεσβείας κ. Percy Wyndham.\*

*“ There arrived yesterday by the steamboat of the French Messageries the eldest son of the First Secretary of the English Legation here, Mr. Percy Wyndham.”*

The foregoing examples will suffice to give a general idea of the Greek language as it exists at the present day. It may be worth while to contrast them with an extract from *The Brut* of Layamon, who lived in Worcestershire and wrote about the year 1200.

Tha he hafden al his iweden :	When he had all his weeds :
Tha leop he on his steden.	Then leapt he on his steed.
Tha he mihte bihalden :	Then might they behold :
Tha bihalues stoden.	Who beside him stood,
Thene uæireste cniht :	The fairest knight :
The verde scolde leden.	That host could lead,
Ne isæh nævere na man :	And ne'er saw man :
Selere cniht nenne.	Better knight any,
Thenne him wes Arthur :	Than was Arthur :—
Athelest cunnes.	He of noblest kin.†

\* κ. is the abbreviation of κύριος.

† ‘History of English Rhythms,’ by Edwin Guest, Esq., M.A., &c., London, 1838, vol. ii. pp. 118, 119.



Truly, as Canon Farrar remarks, "in no other language (but Greek) which the world has ever heard would it be possible to find the works of writers separated from each other by such enormous epochs, and yet equally intelligible to any one who has been trained in the classical form of the language." \* I have no wish, however, to insist upon the present Greek language having a perfect similarity to that of ancient times. The assertion if made would not be correct. Still less would it be true to say that the language of the Klephtic Ballads †—the songs of shepherds and mountaineers—is familiar to the student of Sophocles. They bear a relation to the language of the nation which may perhaps be fitly compared to that which songs in our own provincial dialects bear to our national tongue. At the same time with us the common speech of the people often preserves good old English words, which have dropped out from the cultivated language. And in like

\* 'Language and Languages,' by Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. Longmans, 1878, p. 33.

† An interesting account of the popular ballads and legends of Greece will be found in 'Researches in the Highlands of Turkey,' by the Rev. Henry Fawshawe Tozer, M.A., F.R.G.S., &c., London, 1869, chapters xxviii. and xxix.



manner words, which do not occur in an Athenian newspaper and are scarcely to be found in the ancient authors, may have been handed down by oral tradition from the highest antiquity.\* Again, a word which acquired for itself a meaning more dignified than its original one may re-appear in the speech of the peasants in nearly the sense which it had at the first. Thus the great Athenian trage-

\*“In these journals are to be found many lists of extant provincial dialects, and the phenomena which these dialects present are exceedingly interesting to the philologist. They show that in many cases very early forms and words have survived in the speech of the peasantry, though hardly a trace of them remains in the literary language.” Address delivered at the Inaugural Meeting of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, June 16, 1879, by C. T. Newton, C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., &c., &c.

Professor Ross of Halle writing to Professor Bergh of Marburg says: “My views are founded chiefly on the observation of the dialect used by the common people of Greece, among whom and with whom I have lived so long. This dialect, indeed, now spoken by the Greek shepherds and sailors, and which of course is not to be learnt from books, but from actual intercourse with the people, the majority of philologists are apt to hold cheap, but it has been to me a mine of rich instruction, and I have no hesitation in saying that, at all events, in reference to the non-Attic dialects of the Greek tongue, to Latin, Oscan, and even Etruscan, more may be got from this source than from the many bulky commentaries of the grammarians of the Middle Ages. See what I have said on this point in my ‘Reisen auf den Griechischen Inseln,’ iii. p. 155.” Quoted from Professor Blackie’s Essay, ‘Pronunciation of Greek by Accent and Quantity,’ p. 83.



dies took their rise from the popular dramatic songs called τραγωδίαι—or goat-songs—either because sung by shepherds and goat-herds or because at the festivals a goat was offered in sacrifice.\* The generic name for the popular songs and ballads of the people of the present day is τραγοῦδι, showing it would seem that the word in almost its original application has never fallen out from the speech of the peasants.

Such facts as the above would point to an uninterrupted handing down from generation to generation of one and the same language amongst the people of Greece. Not even the settlement of the Slavs in the country was able to break through the continuity of the chain.† The Greeks were not Slavonized; the Slavs were Hellenized.‡

\* 'History of Grecian Literature,' by William Mure of Caldwell. London, 1854, vol. iii. p. 86.

† "At one time it was maintained that the language had been considerably modified by the Slavonic dialects; as for instance by Heilmaier, in his otherwise excellent treatise 'Ueber die Entstehung der romaischen Sprache unter dem Einflusse fremder Zungen' (pp. 23-24); but this view has been disproved by Miklosich who has shown in his essay entitled 'Die Slawischen Elemente in Neu-griechischen,' how extremely slight that influence has been." Finlay's 'History of Greece,' iv. p. 4 [Editor's note].

‡ "The Hellenic blood appears to have retained through the lapse of ages that same power of assimilation, by which in



The language has spread itself out in various ways,—as by the adoption of auxiliary verbs; it has sometimes shortened its words by dropping a syllable as in *νά* for *ἵνα*, *δέν* for *οὐδέν*, *ψωμί* for *ψωμίον*, *παιδί* for *παιδίον*. Nevertheless it remains the same language, and to one who knows ancient Greek modern Greek is intelligible. Intelligible indeed upon paper, but to most of us incomprehensible in sound.

ancient times it amalgamated with itself the large Pelasgic population of the country. In this way, though physically the modern Greeks may have but a slight, perhaps a very slight, claim to call the ancient Greeks their forefathers, yet in all that really constitutes a people, their character, feelings, and ideas, they are their lineal descendants." 'Researches in the Highlands of Turkey,' vol. ii. p. 306. See also 'Journal of a Tour in Greece,' by William Mure of Caldwell. Edinburgh, 1842, vol. i. p. 148; "Mediæval and Modern Greece," 'Historical Essays,' by Edward A. Freeman, M.A., Hon. D.C.L. and LL.D., &c. Third Series. London. 1879.



## CHAPTER IV.

## GREEK PRONUNCIATION.

It has been remarked\* that to English or American Greek scholars landing at the port of Athens the oral language is as strange as though they were altogether ignorant of Greek. It may be conceded that a foreigner, from having studied Shakespeare, would not necessarily be prepared with a dialogue suited to circumstances on the pier of Dover. But, whatever the difference may be between a language at various epochs or between the language of books and ordinary conversation, no one can understand the speech of a people without being acquainted with their pronunciation. It is this that above all renders an Englishman helpless at the Piræus. Generally it is easier to understand a foreign language at the lips of a native than when spoken by one whose vernacular it is not. But the one thing indis-

\* 'The Greeks of To-day,' by Charles K. Tuckermann, late Minister Resident of the U.S. at Athens. New York, 1873.



pensable for an Englishman to understand Greek is that a Greek should not speak to him. The phrases may be of the most classical kind, but they convey no sense to his ear; and, however cultivated the native on his part may be, the language put into sound by an Englishman is incomprehensible to him.

Having learnt Greek at Harrow and Oxford, it was certainly quite unintelligible to me when I first heard its Grecian sounds by the Lake of Geneva. It was not till an unmistakable word afforded a clue, which the honey of a Swiss breakfast-table gave an opportunity of following up by an allusion to Xenophon,\* that I learnt from my acquaintances that their language was Greek. In olden times, when Theodorus was Archbishop of Canterbury (A.D. 659) and many in England were acquainted with Greek,† I suppose that they spoke it so that it could be understood by a Greek. It was spoken too as

\* "Having passed the summit, the Greeks encamped in a number of villages containing abundance of provisions. As to other things here, there was nothing at which they were surprised; but the number of bee-hives was extraordinary." *Anabasis*, IV. viii. 19, 20. Bohn's Library.

† "Usque hodie supersunt de eorum discipulis, qui Latinam Græcamque linguam æque ut propriam, in qua nati sunt, norunt." Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 2.



the Greeks speak it when its study was revived in the West under the patronage of the Medici. But, apparently through the authority of Erasmus,\* a change was made and a system of pronunciation was adopted that was supposed to represent the mode of speech of the ancients. But, while we have for the last three centuries given up speaking Greek like the Greeks, we have not even retained the system which was propounded as being correct.

Whole books have been written upon the one subject of Greek pronunciation. I cannot presume therefore to do more than touch upon some of the principal points, referring the reader to the volumes quoted below.

$\alpha$  is like the  $\alpha$  of the Italians, or like our  $a$  in *father*.

$\alpha\iota$  is equal to  $ea$  in *measure*.

$\beta$  the Greeks sound invariably like our  $v$ ,—in this resembling the Spaniards, in whose speech  $b$  and  $v$  so often blend into one another as to make it difficult to catch rightly a proper name, for instance, when heard for the first time.

The pronunciation of  $\gamma$  offers of all the letters

\* See Professor Blackie's article "On the Place and Power of Accent in Language." 'Horæ Hellenicæ,' p. 350.



perhaps the greatest difficulty. Before  $\epsilon$ ,  $\iota$ , and  $\upsilon$  it is pronounced as our consonantal  $y$ —thus  $\gammaένος$  is sounded *yenos*;—but before other vowels it has the force of a slightly aspirated  $g$ , of which but little idea can be conveyed in writing, and it is not possible to do more than suggest that  $gh$  is the equivalent of  $\gamma$ . Thus  $\γάλα$  may be represented by *ghala*.

The letter  $\delta$  is never sounded as our  $d$  but as an *aspirated d*. The Keltic tongues have a tendency to aspirate what with us are unaspirated letters,\* and in accordance with this we find in the speech of the Irish the  $d$  becoming *dh* as in that of the Greeks. It is also met with in Spain at the end of a word, such as Madrid. In English  $\delta$  finds its equivalent in the *th* of *this* or *that*.

$\epsilon$  is sounded like *e* in *met*.

$\zeta$  is pronounced as *z* in *zeal* and without any foregoing sound of  $d$ .

It was around the letter  $\eta$  that the chief controversy raged in the sixteenth century. The followers of Erasmus maintained that it should be sounded as *ea* in *bread*, while the opposite party led by Reuchlin defended the Greek pronunciation which gives it the value of *ee*.

\* Peile, p. 17.



The βῆ, βῆ by which Cratinus represents the bleating of sheep never fails to be quoted on this question. But, passing over the fact that the letter η as a vowel was probably not in use in Cratinus' time,\* there is little conclusive or satisfactory evidence to be gained from the imitation of sounds. One of the simplest of sounds, and one which every child likes to imitate, is what we call the "bang" of a gun. Yet the Frenchman says *pam*, the German writes *paff*, and the Norwegian says *boom*. Out of these various descriptions it will be difficult, when explosives in some possible future shall have ceased to exist, to gather what was the exact sound produced by a gun.

θ has the same value as it commonly receives in England, namely that of *th* in *thistle*.

ι is pronounced as *ee*, its usual value in French, German, Italian, &c.

Passing over letters about which there is no difficulty or question we come to υ. To this, as a vowel, is given the same sound as to ι. We

\* "Mr. Geldart rightly rejects any evidence drawn from Cratinus' sheep which said (in our texts) βῆ, βῆ: because in Cratinus' own spelling they must have said βέ, βέ." Peile, p. 244.—See also 'Pronunciation of the Greek Language,' by G. J. Pennington, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London, 1844, p. 20.



have transferred this value to many words, borrowed from the Greek, in which we represent the *v* by *y*, as in *physic*, *syllable*, *labyrinth*. The French call *y* the *i grec*; and in the *Kyrie eléison* (Κύριε ἐλέησον) of the Roman Missal the present Greek pronunciation is represented throughout the two words, viz.: in the *v* (*y*), the *η* (*i*), and in the placing of the accent. There are however many words in which Greeks make the *v* equivalent to their *ου*, or to our *oo*. Thus *τρύπα* is pronounced *τρούπα*, *ξυράφιον* as *ξουράφιον*, *τύμβος* as *τουμβος*, *τύμπανον* as *τούμπανον*.\*

After *α*, *ε*, *η*, *ω*, however, *v* is sounded as a consonant, and has before vowels or before *λ*, *μ*, *ν*, *ρ*, and *ζ*, the force of our *v*, thus *αὐλός* is spoken *avlos*: before other letters than those just mentioned it is pronounced as *f*, as *αὐτός* = *aftos*. On this point again the *αὐ*, *αὐ* of Aristophanes' dogs is often quoted to show that *αὐ*, *αὐ* is the equivalent of our *bow-wow*. This is still less conclusive than the argument drawn from the bleating of sheep. Our *big* dogs bark *bow-wow*, but we do not imitate a lap-dog as though it were a mastiff. Before the dogs of Aristophanes can decide for us the sound of their

\* See also *Æconomos*, Περὶ τῆς γνήσιας πρόφορας κ.τ.λ. p. 134. Geldart, p. 20.



barking we must know whether they were little dogs or big dogs. A friend has mentioned to me that children in Greece do not say *bow-wow* at a dog but *vav, vav, vav*.

When *v* and *ι* come together they take the one sound of *ι*. To *υι* may also be added *ει* and *οι*. Once on a time\* the two letters may have been sounded separately; now however the sound of the last is predominant. We are so much accustomed to look upon *οι* as having the sound of those vowels in *noise* and *poise*,† that it may at the first seem to be the strangest of all combinations expressive of *ee*. But where we have borrowed Greek words in which the diphthong *οι* occurs we have rendered it as it would be spoken in Greek. Thus *Βοιωτία* becomes *Bæotia*, *οικονομία* *economy*.

\* Peile, p. 250. "From the preceding observations it is evident that the change from double to single sounds began very early." Thiersch, *Greek Grammar*, London, 1830, p. 41.

† "And I think of those long mornings,  
Which my Thought goes far to seek,  
When, betwixt the folio's turnings,  
Solemn flowed the rhythmic Greek.  
Past the pane the mountain spreading,  
Swept the sheep-bell's tinkling noise,  
While a girlish voice was reading,  
Somewhat low for *ai*'s and *oi*'s."

—Elizabeth Browning, "Wine of Cyprus."



χ is not pronounced as with us in the same way as κ, but as a guttural *h*. It may be compared to *ch* in the Scotch *loch*; but it finds its equivalent better still in the Spanish *j*, or in the *g* before *e* and *i*, as for example in *jamás* and *general*. A distinction is thus made, which we fail to observe, between words like Κρόνος *Saturn* and χρόνος *time*, ἐκὼν *willing* and ἔχων *having*.

The above are the chief features of Greek pronunciation so far as regards the value of the letters. The number of written expressions for the sound of *ee* will be noticed by every reader, and this *iotacism*, as it is called because *iota* is taken as the typical representative of the *ee*, will not be passed over without a comment. But although an anomaly in one language does not prove that it ought likewise to exist in another, it may be worth while, before passing hasty criticism upon the Greeks, to reflect that while they have *six* different ways of representing the sound of *ee* we have no fewer than *eight*.

We have

<i>e</i> as in <i>me</i> ,	<i>ie</i> as in <i>field</i> ,
<i>ee</i> „ <i>see</i> ,	<i>i</i> „ <i>policeman</i> ,
<i>ea</i> „ <i>tea</i> ,	<i>æ</i> „ <i>æsthetics</i> ,
<i>ei</i> „ <i>receive</i> ,	<i>æ</i> „ <i>Phœbe</i> .



The "Spelling Reform Association" may perhaps modify this; but it is easier to change the spelling of words than to alter the speech of a nation. In the meantime, we are not so out of conceit with our own language as to think that it is utterly disfigured by a variety of letters expressive of the same sound. It would be reasonable too for a Greek to say that we should know his language as spoken before we censure it from a tabular statement of letters.\*

When, however, we come to the question of the sound of those letters in ancient times, it may readily be granted that at some time or other a distinction was made between the various written expressions. But the tendency to iotacism can be traced back to classical times, and it appears to be the legitimate outcome of influences even then at work.† Especially it

\* "Though the modern pronunciation applied absolutely to certain picked lines of the ancient classics might produce a very petty vocal effect, it does not at all follow that the same result will be produced when the modern language is used by those who know how to handle it." 'Horæ Hellenicæ,' p. 154.

† "Even in the best days of Greece, likewise, the pronunciation must have tended strongly to Iotacism." Thiersch, Greek Grammar, p. 43.

"We can trace the tendency throughout the historical period of the Greek language, and find it more and strongly marked as the language grows older." Geldart, p. 18.



seems to have prevailed in Bœotia.\* Therefore when we speak with the Greek pronunciation we do not assert—as indeed the natives themselves do not †—that we speak in all respects as the Greeks of classical days. Yet at least we can say that our manner of speech is nearly the same as that of the Greeks more than a thousand years ago. “It is demonstrably certain,” writes Dr. Wagner, “that Plutarch or Lucian pronounced to all intents or purposes like the modern Greeks except that they seem to have been more careful of prosody and quantity.” ‡

\* “In Bœotian the change to *ι* is very extensive: the set of the dialect is to this vowel just as in modern Greek.” Peile, p. 276.

† ἐνταῦθα δ’ αὖθις ἐπαναλαμβάνοντες λέγομεν, ὅτι διαφορά τις ἦν πάλαι παρὰ τοῖς καθαρῶς ἐλληνίζουσι τῆς τοῦ *η*, *ι*, καὶ *υ* ἐκφωνήσεως, δι’ ἣν τὸ ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν, κ.τ.λ., ἀκοῇ μόνῃ ἀπ’ ἀλλήλων διέκρινον· ὅτι δ’ αὕτη βραχυτάτη καὶ οὐκ αἰσθητὴ ἦν, ἐκ τῶν λεχθέντων αὐτάρκως δέδεικται. Α. Γεωργιάδης, Περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν στοιχείων ἐκφωνήσεως. Paris, 1812, p. 100. See also Æconomos, p. 11.

‡ Academy, June 15, 1871.



## CHAPTER V.

## THE ACCENTS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

COLONEL LEAKE has remarked that, even if we alter our pronunciation as regards the letters, “we shall still be unintelligible to the modern Greeks unless we adopt their accent. This change would have an effect far more striking than any reformation in the letters. It would thoroughly alter the character of the language.”\* Greek as spoken by a Greek is, apart from the sound of the letters, something totally different from Greek spoken by an Englishman. England may say to herself of her Greek:

“Well spoken with good accent and good discretion,”† but Greece will reply that she has acquired a barbarous unknown speech:

*ἀγνώτα φωνὴν βάρβαρον κεκτημένη.‡*

---

\* ‘Researches in Greece,’ by William Martin Leake, Colonel in the Royal Artillery, &c., &c. 1814, p. 209.

† Hamlet, act ii. scene 2.

‡ Æsch. Agam. 1051.



Whence then is the great difference derived? Is it that the Greeks have altogether altered the accentuation of their own language, while we, who re-introduced its study amidst opposing factions of "Greeks and Trojans"\* at our Universities, have retained the right expression of a speech which we had allowed to fall into disuse?

The nature of the accentual marks has been thus simply and lucidly explained: "Every Greek word of two or more syllables had one syllable which was sounded on a higher key than the rest of the word: thus λυ in λελύκοιμι, κε in λελυκένοι, κός in λελυκός. For a long time, the Greeks in writing their language made no attempt to distinguish the syllable which was thus sounded in a higher key: they aimed to represent the substance of their sounds, but not their relative pitch. It was not until the development of grammatical study, in the Alexandrian period, that the grammarian Aristophanes of Byzantium, about 200 years before our era, invented a sign for this purpose. Over the vowel which was sounded on a higher

\* 'Introduction to the Literature of Europe,' by Henry Hallam, LL.D., F.R.A.S., &c. London, 1855, i. p. 293, note.



key he placed a wedge-like mark, sloping downward to the left, which was called ἡ ὀξεῖα προσῳδία, 'sharp accent,' 'acute accent.' But it often happened, in the utterance of a long vowel or diphthong, that the higher key with which the word began was not maintained to the end; that after pronouncing the first part on a higher key the voice dropped down to a lower, and on this pronounced the last part of the long sound. For such cases Aristophanes introduced a compound sign; representing the higher key as before, he added, to represent the lower key, a similar mark, but sloping downward to the right. The roof formed by the joining of the two marks was rounded off in writing, and the whole was called ἡ περισπωμένη προσῳδία, 'twisted accent,' 'circumflex accent.' The ordinary lower key was not generally represented by any distinctive mark: if the vowel of a syllable had no mark of higher pitch written above it, this was a sufficient indication of its lower pitch. And, indeed, there was nothing in this lower pitch that called for designation. The essential fact to be recognized and made evident in writing was not that some syllables were lower than the rest: it was that



some were higher than the rest; or rather that one syllable in each word was made conspicuous above all others by the higher key on which it was sounded." \*

Languages are not without accents in the speech of a people, but they are not necessarily expressed in writing.† Aristophanes did not determine how the words should be pronounced, nor did he settle upon which syllables the accentual marks should be placed. But, taking the language as it was, he wrote the marks over the syllables which were accented in speaking. It is not supposed that this was done for the benefit of the Greeks alone. They knew their own language and the sound of its words, and it was unnecessary to point out to them how

\* 'Essays Philological and Critical,' by James Hadley, LL.D., Professor of Greek in Yale College, &c., &c. New York, 1873, p. 110.

† "Idem porro Aristophanes Byzantius προσῳδίαν sive accentus excogitavit, non quod ad illam usque ætatem Græca lingua accentibus et spiritibus caruerit: nulla enim potest lingua sine accentu et spiritu pronuntiari; sed quod ille ea, quæ usus magister invexerat, ad certas normas et regulas deduxerit, signa et formas invenerit, quo loco essent constituendi accentus et spiritus docuerit."—Montfaucon, 'Palæographia Græca.' Paris, 1708, p. 33. See also 'Essay on Accent and Quantity,' by John Foster, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. London, 1820, 3rd Ed., p. 100. Thiersch, Greek Grammar, p. 86.



the words were to be pronounced.\* But to strangers learning Greek, and of these there were many after the conquests of Alexander,† it was a help to find marked in each word the syllable on which the accent should fall.

The marks have doubtless had great influence in preserving the accentuation from change, whether brought in by strangers or gradually introduced by the natives themselves. In our own language words are subject to a change of accentuation in course of time, and perhaps accentual marks might with advantage be written over some of our words.‡ We have a tendency to place the accent as near the beginning of a word as possible. Thus *illustrate* is now more common than *illústrate*. *Bálcony* used to follow the accentuation of the Italians from whom it was borrowed, but it is seldom, if ever, that *balcóny* is heard. *Trafalgar* is

\* "The ancient Greeks did not need any signs for the accent: but as in course of time a faulty pronunciation crept in, the grammarian, Aristophanes of Byzantium (A.C. 200), restored the accents according to the traditional Athenian intonation." Kühner, *Greek Grammar*, Oxford, 1851, § 43. 3, Obs. 6.

† Born B.C. 356.

‡ See "The English Language as Spoken and Written." by Professor F. W. Newman, 'Contemporary Review,' March, 1878.



accentuated by Byron as pronounced on the spot :

“Oft did he mark the scenes of vanished war,  
Actium, Lepanto, fatal Trafalgar.” \*

But at the present day *Trafalgár* has yielded to *Trafálgar*.

In Greece the speech of the people is in accordance with the accents as expressed in writing. The most illiterate peasant observes them in speaking,† and the little child that cannot read does not prattle without them. They are an inseparable part of the language, and, as such, point by an unbroken succession to the speech of the ancients, and connect together the present with the past. It is difficult to suppose that all Greeks should in their daily conversation agree in speaking in one and the

\* ‘Childe Harold,’ ii. 40.

† “The more illiterate the Greek is, whom you hear so pronouncing his native tongue, the more forcible is the conviction that by tradition alone can he have learnt this pronunciation. He calls it *πραγμάτων*, because he has heard his mother call it so; and *πολλοὶ*, because he, poor fellow! has never been taught, as we have, to write it as if it were an oxytone, and read it as if it were not: and if you take him to carry your game-bag, he calls out, on seeing a woodcock, ‘*ἰδοὺ, ἰδοὺ!*’ in a tone which by no means leads you to suppose that he is thinking of Aristophanes of Byzantium.” Pennington, p. 257.



same manner, according as the accents are written, if this method had been introduced by an artificial or arbitrary device. It is hardly conceivable that, out of deference to authority, the common every-day speech of vine-dressers, herdsmen, sailors, and fishermen should have been altered from what it was to something both novel and strange. One can more reasonably presume that the accentual marks, while they were corrective of faulty pronunciation, represented the ancient accentuation of the language.\*

Thus in the living speech of to-day, which is in accordance with the position of the written marks, we have a reflection of the speech of the

\* "The opinion, that the pronunciation of the modern Greeks is altogether corrupt, cannot be supported by proof, and the supposition, that it became so in consequence of the written accents, is extremely rash. No people accommodates the mouth and ear to the requisitions of the eye, at least to such a degree as this would infer. Besides, the present pronunciation is universal even among the wildest mountain-clans of Greece, who have perhaps not seen anything in a written shape for a period of two thousand years." Thiersch, *Greek Grammar*, p. 90.

"It is very difficult to believe that words, every letter of which is in many instances the same as in the time of Euripides or Xenophon, should now have a totally different sound, and this not by any operation that can be traced to the prevalence of local corruptions, or the progress of barbarism, but by a complete change of system in regard to accent, admitting of scarcely any exceptions." Leake, *Researches in Greece*, p. 220.



Greeks of old. Nestor, the mellifluous speaker of the Grecian warriors of Troy, was the living link that connected the chiefs of the time with the heroes of bygone years.

“Two generations of the sons of men  
For him were past and gone, who with himself  
Were born and bred on Pylos’ lovely shore,  
And o’er the third he now held royal sway.”\*

Generations of men have come and gone, and the modulations of to-day recall the eloquence of the past.

We have already seen that, according to Professor Hadley, the accents denoted a raising of the tone of voice upon the syllable accented. And, setting aside questions as to whether there is included in accent a *force-stress* of voice or an *emphasis*,† it is perhaps best for us to consider the accents as denoting *pitch*. For we are prone to look upon an accented syllable as a long one; and we thereupon confound accent and quantity, which ought to be distinguished from one

\* Iliad, i. 297, Lord Derby’s Translation.

† See Peile, p. 212-215; Blackie, “On the Place and Power of Accent in Language,” ‘*Horæ Hellenicæ*’; Hadley, “On the Nature and Theory of the Greek Accent,” ‘*Essays Critical and Philological*.’



another.\* But it will be some safeguard against this tendency to remember that a high note in music is not therefore a long one. Pitch does not determine musical length, and it need not be a rule that it should do so in language.

Next, our intonation of voice is less varied than that of most other nations. The Italian, the Spaniard, and even the German, speaks in more musical tones than ourselves. The Greeks offer no less distinct a contrast. Their tones are full of cadence and melody, and the voice glides from one accented syllable to another as the crest upon a wave of the sea. It will be useful therefore that we should look upon the accents as directing a rise of the voice, in order that we may free ourselves from a monotony relieved only by emphasis and that we may acquire that lightness and melody of expression which add so much to the elegance of Greek. It is said of Caius Gracchus that, when he made a speech, he had a person concealed behind him with an

\* "Time and tone are by no means the same qualities of a syllable. And accordingly the terms of one are not applicable to the other. You are deceived, if you say that acute and long, or grave and short, are the same. I must enlarge a little on this, because the generality of grammarians are apt to blunder wretchedly in this affair." Melanchthon, quoted by Foster, p. 62.



ivory pitch-pipe, who by sounding a note should recall him from too elevated a tone or remind him that he was falling too low.\* This is a part that the accents, irrespective of their other effects, may profitably play for ourselves.

To those who have not been accustomed to their use they naturally present some difficulties. We are but little accustomed by our own language to words sharply accented on the last syllable. In words such as *contént*, *agrée*, we have a tendency to give a heavy, prolonged, sound, rather than the sharp, light, rap that the Italian gives to the final syllable of *carità*, *perchè*, *virtù*, or with which the Spaniard terminates such words as *Alcalá*, *levanté*, *subí*, *tomó*. Again, it has been our practice to accentuate perhaps the greater number of Greek words on a different syllable from that to which the Greeks give the accent. Consequently, as spoken by a Greek, the words sound as strange at the first as *Piccá-dilly* to an Englishman, or *Balmorál* to a Scotchman. This, however, is due chiefly to habit, and the ear perceives nothing strange after a short time, but rather shudders at the old accentuation.

\* Cicero de Oratore, iii. 60.



I venture also to think that force of habit has much to do with a difficulty about reconciling accent with quantity. If all other nations were as perplexed upon this matter as we are ourselves, there would be greater reason for hesitation. But the eminent German grammarians Matthiæ, Buttmann, Kühner, and Thiersch, do not seem to have felt a serious difficulty in the matter, as they commonly teach that accents and quantity should both be observed.\*

As in Greek so in English, words often shift their accents as they somewhat alter their form. Thus when *ἄνθρωπος* becomes *ἀνθρώπου* in the

\* "The pronunciation of Greek words is regulated by two considerations, the quantity of the syllables, and the accent. . . . These two considerations must be combined in the pronunciation, and it is equally incorrect to pronounce merely according to accent, e. g. *ἄνθρωπος*, *Ὀμηρος*, as *ānthrōpōs*, *Hōmērōs*, or merely according to quantity." Matthiæ, *Greek Grammar*. London, 1824, vol. ii. p. 952.

"In the pronunciation of Greek regard ought to be had both to accent and quantity. The accented syllable should be distinctly pronounced with its appropriate pitch and at the same time the quantity of each syllable distinctly marked." Kühner, *Greek Grammar*, § 43. 3, Obs. 5.

"Reflection and practice have already enabled us to remove in part the contradiction, which appeared to prevail between quantity and accent; and it is worthy of the exertions of the learned to endeavour to restore this essential ingredient of the melody of the Greek language." Buttmann, *Greek Grammar*. London, 1833, § 8. 3. See also Thiersch, *Greek Grammar*, § 47.



genitive case it transfers the accent from the *α* to the *ω*. Likewise when *majesty* changes to *majestic*, the accent moves from the *α* to the *ε*.

Similarly :—

<i>acádemy</i>	becomes	<i>académical</i> ,
<i>círcumstance</i>	„	<i>circumstántial</i> ,
<i>cústody</i>	„	<i>custódian</i> ,
<i>súbstance</i>	„	<i>substántial</i> ,
<i>théatre</i>	„	<i>theátrical</i> .

It is obvious that a syllable at one time accented cannot, when it becomes unaccented, occupy the same place in a line of poetry regulated by accent. But it is not so plain that a syllable is long when accented, and that it becomes short when the accent is removed.

The less acquainted the ear is with the sound of Greek accentuated according to the marks and to the Hellenic tradition, the greater will difficulties appear. But, with a familiarity with Greek as spoken by the people of Greece, the stumbling-blocks will gradually vanish. What sixty-five years ago Colonel Leake remarked on this point will be found to be true at the present: “As the stranger becomes familiar with Romaic, he becomes sensible of the superior



harmony of modern accent in pronunciation, and is at length much more shocked at hearing the ancient words, contained in Romaic, pronounced according to the mode he has been taught at school, than at the supposed violation of quantity in the recitation of ancient compositions. Such at least was the progress of my own feelings upon this subject, as well as of several others in similar circumstances with whom I have conversed.” \*

\* ‘Researches in Greece,’ p. 210.



## CHAPTER VI.

## THE LIVING ATTRACTIONS OF GREEK.

THERE is a certain air of mystery about Greek, which gives a dignified charm to commonplace things expressed in Hellenic phraseology. But the very appearance of the language, though it makes it an object of admiration to some, has the effect of filling it with terror to others.

There is no doubt that Greek presents difficulties peculiar to itself. Its look is strange to us ; and it is a language which seems to be removed in kind from anything coming under our ordinary observation. Perhaps this may be due partly to imagination. Nevertheless, the first impressions produced by the appearance of the language tend to exaggerate the difficulties of its study. This is the more to be regretted as the merits of Greek are such, that whatever can give it greater favour in the eyes of students, and thereby encourage a fuller acquaintance both with the language and the literature, is a help to our intellectual life.



There is a period at which all that in our minds is associated with Greece was in a high state of perfection. The cultivation of everything that is beautiful and refined in painting, sculpture, or literature, has descended to us as an heir-loom from Greece. It is without doubt the language and literature of that time which are most worthy of our attention. But it has not been an uncommon conclusion for younger students to arrive at that, with the expiration of that epoch, the literature of Greece came to an end and the Greek language ceased to exist.

Consequently, Greek is looked upon as belonging only to the past and as having no relation to anything of the present. The further deduction is that it is useless; and the practical conclusion from this is to set it aside altogether.

It is here that the language of to-day may be of infinite service. Its similarity to the language as enshrined in the writings of the great classical authors is an evidence of the wonderful vitality of Greek, and of the continuity of its life from the days of Homer until our own. Greece ceases to be the fabulous country whose existence a wearied imagination strives vainly to realize, when it is seen to be the native land of



some millions of people speaking, to this very hour, what is little else than a modification of the speech of the ancient Hellenes. The present language, whatever its merits, is a living fact; and, as such, lends an interest and a freshness to the classical times by rescuing them from an isolated past, and by placing them in evident connection with the ages succeeding them.\*

When a good knowledge has been gained of the language, a comparison of the various dialects of olden times with one another will be appreciated. But a more lively and a wider interest will be aroused by having a spoken language to which to refer. The words and modes of expression of the ancient authors, whose works may be read, will find their illustrations in the speech of the people of the present day. The student will perceive that the language he learns, while it is one of the most

\* "Here then is something more in the Greek tongue, something more abiding, something which more nearly touches the general history of mankind, than is to be found in that view of it which looks on it as dead, ancient, classical, cut off from modern interests of every kind. I claim for the Greek tongue its place on the exactly opposite ground, because it is not dead but living, because, if it is ancient, it is mediæval and modern no less." "Shall we give up Greek?" by E. A. Freeman, 'Fortnightly Review,' February 1, 1879.



perfect and beautiful the world has ever seen, may also be of practical use by way of guide and introduction to Greek as now spoken. Thus, instead of lamenting a study thought to concern only the books on the shelf, he will be conscious of laying the foundations of a language that may serve him at Constantinople, Alexandria, and Athens, and throughout the islands and shores of the Levant. Many a one, it is true, will never set his foot on Grecian soil. But, while it would be unworthy to study Greek for its modern value alone, the very fact that ancient Greek leads directly to the spoken language of Greece, and may thus at any time be of practical use, gives that incitement to its study which the prospect of a tangible result seldom fails to impart.

The pronunciation draws still closer the bond between the past and the present.\* Though

\* "We further suggested, though not with much hope of any one receiving it seriously, that it might be well to take up the modern pronunciation of Greek, not as being identical with that of the age of Pericles, but as being descended from it by an unbroken process. Englishmen would thus learn from the very first the continuity of Greek life and language, a fact which is not only of historical importance, but may become of immediate political importance for England within a generation or two." "The Study of Greek," 'Saturday Review,' January 11, 1879.



that of the moderns is not in all things as was that of the ancients, nevertheless it carries us far back towards the beginning of the Christian era. Whatever modifications it has undergone, it is only reasonable to presume that, if the sound and character of the ancient tongue are preserved and represented by any one, it is by that people whose native language is Greek. As Mr. Ellis remarks: "But still it is Greek, and of no other pronunciation we can invent can we say that it ever *was* Greek."\* This very fact, together with the feeling that in speaking it thus we are speaking the language as intelligible to a native of Greece, gives it a life and an attraction which is otherwise sought for in vain.

It may however be asked whether a nearer approach to the mode of speech of the ancients might not be made than by adopting the pronunciation of the moderns. Such a suggestion has already been offered, yet the learned author who broached it seems to have regarded the plan as one very difficult to carry out.† Greek pro-

\* "On Greek Pronunciation Theoretical and Practical," by Alexander J. Ellis, F.R.S., F.S.A., 'Trans. Philol. Soc.' 1874.

† Thiersch, Greek Grammar, § xvii.



nunciation has been very fertile of controversy ; and it may well be that to arrive at an agreement upon the question of what was the exact pronunciation of the ancients would be as difficult now as it was three centuries ago. There might be much discussion, followed by little result.

Moreover, wherever there is no living rule to which to conform, a pronunciation is sure to deflect from the original standard. French in the mouth of an Englishman is not always like the speech of a Frenchman, and it would probably soon cease to have any resemblance to it at all if French as in France were not at hand as a constant corrective. The Greek of Erasmus was taken to be the more perfect representative of the speech of the old Greeks. But notwithstanding this we have not wholly retained it. More than this, its sounds, unrepresented by a living speech, have not been able to give an attraction to Greek. They have, on the contrary, set up a barrier between the Greeks and ourselves, and have formed a wide chasm between the classical ages and the present day.

Greek as in Greece need raise no controversy. The question will still remain open as to what



was precisely the ancient mode of speaking the language, and each one may hold whatever view he may think best supported by evidence.

There may be some difficulties attending the introduction and use of the pronunciation of the Greeks, but there are not wanting advantages to counterbalance them. The *iotacism* may cause some confusion at first, especially to those accustomed to the old pronunciation; but the sweeter melody and harmony of the language will speedily banish the early associations.\* Greek becomes a speech in which the pleasant banter of Aristophanes and the familiar conversations of Plato assume a graceful and a natural tone. Again, it is easy to ascertain what the pronunciation is; and the explanation that it is the mode of speech of the Greeks can be appreciated by all, and will rouse at once a feeling in its favour.

\* "In conclusion, with regard to the practical question, how we are to pronounce Greek, I can only state, from my personal experience and that of others similarly circumstanced, my unalterable conviction, that the man who has once learned to read Greek fluently, with accent and intonation as the Greeks read it, will never be able to tolerate either Homer or Xenophon or Sophocles read with the Latin accent and the mis-called Erasmian pronunciation." Geldart, p. 66.



The accents, moreover, are no longer a puzzle and an object of terror.\* Nothing indeed can be more wearisome than to learn a number of dry, abstract, rules which are immediately contradicted in practice. The further removed we are from the time when Greek was spoken in England according to the speech of the Greeks, the greater does the difficulty regarding the accents seem to become. That is to say, the less we know of the accents as affecting the spoken language, the more incomprehensible does the accentual theory appear. A hundred years ago it was apparently considered that the accents were easy even to boys learning Greek.† Now they are often thought to be so full of difficulties that the consideration is deferred to a late period of study. But if, from the first, they are put to the use for which they were originally intended, and are allowed to serve as guides to

\* "Then the accents—the terrible accents; so important that the grammarians had to invent them to assist foreigners in distress;—what distress have they caused to us poor foreigners." Alex. J. Ellis, 'Trans. Philol. Soc.' 1872, p. 24.

† See the Preface to 'Institutio Græcæ Grammatices compendiarie in usum regie scholæ Westmonasteriensis,' Londini, 1775, "Hinc enim pueri eadem opera, qua voces declinabiles inflectere discunt, *Accentuum* etiam *diversam rationem* facile percipient; cujus rei accurata cognitio magnam sæpe in Græca lingua adfert utilitatem." p. vii.



the pronunciation of the words, the alarming perplexities vanish and the rules of the accents are acquired in the ordinary course of learning the language.

But how, it may be asked, can such a practice be carried out as that of teaching Greek with the Greek accents and sounds? With the greatest ease: if each one who teaches will learn the pronunciation himself. One generation of students soon gives place to another, the boys who to-day begin learning Greek will be succeeded next year by others to whom its sounds are unknown. They will have no habits to unlearn, no prejudices of which to divest themselves, and they will learn Greek, as spoken by the Greeks, as easily—and more gladly—than as pronounced by ourselves.\* No one who realizes the importance of putting life into a subject, and rendering it attractive to students, will grudge the little care and trouble necessary for acquiring a pronunciation with which he may be unacquainted.

\* “Why children should not be taught foreign vowel-sounds in Latin, as well as in French and German, would pass comprehension if we did not know that the difficulties were not felt by the boys but by the masters.” Alex. J. Ellis, ‘Trans. Philol. Soc.’ 1872, p. 401.



The time available now for any one subject is less than a student could formerly command. There is all the more need for the energies to be stimulated and for the vigour of mind to be roused. What is done willingly and gladly is usually done better than what is undertaken with reluctance. It will be a boon to the young to have Greek rescued from the wearisome dulness with which it has been often associated, and to have it set before them not only as it refers to the past but also as it relates to the present. Those who have laid Greek aside may yet be prompted by its continued vitality to refresh themselves with the beauties of its literature and to encourage in others a zeal for its study.

If, while we enhance the beauty of the language and give expression to its harmony, we also extend its cultivating and refining influence, it is no fanciful suggestion but one full of importance and value that we should speak Greek as in Greece.



## APPENDIX I.

## ACCENTS IN GREEK VERSE.

It will naturally be expected that I should not pass over in silence the interesting question of the power of the accents in the old Greek poetry. I have thought it preferable, however, not to embarrass the main drift of the argument of the preceding pages by introducing a subject somewhat complicated, and I have therefore left it to be dealt with in an Appendix.

The poetry of modern times is regulated chiefly\* by *accents*: each line consisting of a certain number of syllables with accents recurring at regular intervals. On the other hand the poetry of the ancient Greeks was regulated chiefly by *quantity*, and accordingly a line of their poetry is made up of a certain number of feet. Each foot, again, contains a definite number

\* “Both in ancient and modern poetry the ἀρχιτεκτονική, or sovereign science, as the Rev. G. Perkins well points out in the ‘Journal of Philology’ (vol. i. 253–263), is not metre, nor quantity, nor accent, but rhythm, to which the former are merely subsidiary.” Geldart, p. 49.



of syllables whose position, according as they are short or long in quantity, is regulated by the metre to which the line of verse is conformable.

When a line of quantitative poetry is read so as to give expression to the metre, a stress will fall upon one of the long syllables in each foot, marking thereby the recurrence of certain long syllables at regular intervals. For instance, in Homer's hexameters there will be a stress upon the *first* syllable of each foot. This is called the *ictus* or metrical stress.

If a line of modern Greek poetry be read, it will be found that the written accent of the words and the *ictus* coincide. On the other hand if we take a line of ancient poetry, it will be seen that the written accent of the word and the metrical stress only coincide occasionally.

Thus, as Professor Hadley mentions, in "the first seven lines of the Iliad, out of the forty-two cases of *ictus* which they present, only sixteen are found on syllables which have the written accent." \*

The question hereupon arises as to whether the ancient Greeks, who wrote poetry according

\* 'Essays Philological and Critical,' p. 115.



to the rules of quantitative measure, observed the accents in reciting their verses, or whether they disregarded them and gave expression to the metrical ictus alone.

The various opinions which have been expressed may, I think, be represented by the following cases. That is to say, the requirements of some one of the solutions proposed would be satisfied :

1. If the accent and the metrical stress coincided.

2. If the accent being *pitch* do not interfere with effect being given to the metrical stress.

3. If the accent and metrical stress can fall on different syllables—effect being given to the accent—consistently with the rhythm of the verse.

The first case either presupposes the accentuation of the language to have been different in the days of the great poets from what it was in the time of Aristophanes of Byzantium; or it requires that prose should be read with the accents and verse without them.

Considering the short period which intervened between Aristophanes the Comedian and Aristo-



phanes the Grammarian—about 140 years\*—it is difficult, without having direct proof to that effect, to assent to the theory that the accentuation was changed. For, if we accept the statement of Kühner that Aristophanes the Grammarian placed the accents upon the words according to the Athenian tradition, the space of time in which the change could have taken place becomes still more limited. It must have taken at least sixty years for a completely altered accentuation to become common to the bulk of the population, so as to have the authority of a tradition. Consequently, there would remain only about seventy or eighty years during which the change could take place, a period graced by Aristotle and Demosthenes. It would be necessary then, although no record is left of the occurrence, to believe that the accents changed places, and that most of the accented syllables became unaccented and that many unaccented ones received the accent.

The suggestion that prose should be read with the accents, and poetry without them, seems also open to objection. The words of a language

\* "Accent-marks were introduced about B.C. 264, fifty-eight years after the death of Demosthenes." 'Greek Syntax,' by James Clyde, M.A., LL.D. Edinburgh, 1870.



are the same wherever they may be. As they are in the language so they go into composition whether of prose or of verse. This admits however of some qualification. As each word stands by itself it retains unimpaired its own distinctive peculiarity. But when a word accented on the last syllable occurs in the middle of a sentence its accent is softened. It becomes subordinated to the rhythm of the sentence. Similarly, in verse it would be subordinated to the rhythm of the verse. In this sense therefore I can understand the suggestion that poetry should be read without the accents; but then I mean no more than that it should be read so as to give due expression to the rhythm.

There is again an opinion that Greek verse was written not to be read, but to be sung. If the poetry was always to be sung and never to be read, and if the words were in all cases subordinated to the music, then indeed all difficulties will disappear. But the first would be an assertion somewhat too universal to be prudently made, and the second has the weight of good authority against it. Colonel Mure in his '*History of Grecian Literature*'\* says that "the

\* Vol. iii. p. 11.



accompaniment was considered, as a general rule, altogether subservient to the words both in its adaptation to the character and genius of the poem, and in the special adjustment of its numbers to the length or brevity, gravity or vivacity, of the verses and of their syllables and feet."

The second case which, if I have correctly understood the writings of Hadley \* and Thiersch,† represents the opinion of those eminent scholars, appears to me to present only the difficulty of being extremely refined and subtle. This, however, may be due to inability on my own part to appreciate the refinement of an accent which should be so free from stress of voice (*force-stress*) as to admit of the metrical stress being distinctly predominant. Perhaps, however, Thiersch does not mean so much as this, as he speaks of being able to distinguish the poetical rhythm *through*‡ the accentuation proper to the language. In this view I should find no difficulty, the more so as the third case is indeed but a slight modification of this.

Lastly, then, as a matter of fact the accent and the metrical stress as a rule, fall upon different

\* 'Essays Philological and Critical.'

† Greek Grammar, § 47.

‡ The italics are my own.



syllables. Can effect be given to the accents, even as they are known to us, consistently with the rhythm of the verse? Or is it necessary that the old Greek poetry should be read so that the metrical stress shall be predominant and the accents shall disappear?

Our own poetry is regulated chiefly by accents. Nevertheless it does not belong to the perfection of reading English verse to give continual expression to the accentual stress. To do this would be to give a sing-song effect which every good reader avoids. In like manner it need not be expected that a reciter of Homer should, line after line, force upon the attention of his audience the metrical stress. What a skilful reader of modern poetry does, in avoiding the jingling monotony produced by an unvarying prominence being given to the accentual stress, the ancients effectually secured in the composition of their poetry by so arranging it that, for the most part, the metrical stress should not fall upon an accented syllable. If it be asked then why Homer, Æschylus, Sophocles and other poets of the classical period did not write their poetry so that the verses should scan as they are read, I answer—with all deference to the judgment of



others—that they may have purposely arranged their verses in such a manner as to prevent an unskilful reader from marring their beauty by the monotony of perpetual scansion.

What is here said of the old Greek poetry holds good also as to the Latin. It has often been pointed out that no one reads the following line of Virgil according to the metrical stress; that is to say it is not read,

*Ítaliám fató profugús Lavinia venit,*

but thus,

*Itáliam fáto prófugus Lavinia venit.*

Nevertheless the lines of Virgil sound to our ears as poetry, and it appears to me that the Iliad of Homer will not the less be recognized as poetry even though the metre be not continually marked.

Moreover, as a writer in the 'Edinburgh Review,'\* has pointed out, much of the true effect of the ancient poetry may be entirely lost by not observing the accents. Thus he cites a line from the Odyssey† describing the stone of Sisyphus. Any one who has watched a stone rolling down a steep hill will have seen it go,

\* July, 1805, p. 366.

† xi. 598.



bound after bound, till at last it either quietly comes to rest upon level ground or has its onward course suddenly checked.

*Αὖτις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδῆς.*

The stone bounds, and bounds, and bounds, till at last, abruptly arrested, it comes to a stop; the line thus giving, as the writer observes, a remarkable instance of imitative harmony.

In further illustration of the view that the old Greeks intentionally avoided the coincidence of the metrical stress with the accent, it is worthy of observation that there are not wanting lines in the ancient poetry where the coincidence does occur. They were not unacquainted therefore with the effect produced; but they used it sparingly.

Examples may be found in Sophocles' 'Modern Greek Grammar,' and his 'Glossary of Later and Byzantine Greek,' from which Mr. Geldart quotes, amongst others, the two following instances:

*Iliad ii. 188:—*

*"Οντινα μὲν βασιλῆα καὶ ἔξοχον ἄνδρα κιχείη.*

*Aristophanes, Lys. 310:—*

*Κὰν μὴ καλούντων τοὺς μοχλοὺς χαλῶσιν αἱ γυναῖκες.*



The following stanza of Archilochus\* will afford an example of an unrestrained flow being allowed in the first two lines and being checked in the last two.

ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος,  
 σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὄρας,  
 λεωργὰ καθέμιστα· σοὶ δὲ θηρίων,  
 ὕβρις τε καὶ δίκη μέλει.†

Colonel Mure in quoting them gives the following translation :‡

Jove, father Jove, o'er heaven and earth who reign'st,  
 In power divine, supreme, alone ;  
 To thee each dark unrighteous deed of man,  
 Each wayward mood of fowl or brute is known.

With the view, however, of imitating the lines somewhat more closely than as above, I have ventured to render the original as follows :

O Jove, father Jove, thine's the might of the heavens,  
 Thou the works of mankind overseest,  
 Their acts knavish and lawless ;—and of the wild beasts  
 The rage and the ways are thy care.

To my taste, there is something much more effective in the gradually diminishing movement

\* B.C. 728.

† No. 87. Bergk (*Poetæ Lyrici Græci*) reads καὶ θεμιστά.

‡ 'History of Grecian Literature,' vol. iii. p. 168.



with which an observance of the accents brings the stanza to a close than is to be obtained from the regular scansion of the lines, or from the accentual English rendering just given.

Amongst the various writings that touch upon accents in Greek verse there is none more conspicuous for its lucid and able treatment than Mr. Geldart's valuable chapter on 'Accent and Quantity.'\* I would refer the reader to his pages for fuller and more perfect explanations. The subject is one fraught with so many nice and difficult questions that I cannot hope to have treated it as it deserves. I have stated my own views with as little hesitation and as clearly as possible. If I have erred in any point I shall be the more easily corrected; and I express myself in full deference to others who are more qualified, and better able to form a judgment, than myself.

\* 'Modern Greek Language,' chap. iii. See also 'Horæ Hellenicæ,' pp. 383-392; "On Ancient Greek Rhythm and Metre," 'Essays Philol. and Crit.' by Prof. Hadley, pp. 81-109; *Æconomos*, pp. 642-671.



## APPENDIX II.

## TABLE OF EQUIVALENTS OF LETTERS.

*Italian Pronunciation of Latin.*

a	=	a in <i>father</i> .
e	=	e in <i>met</i> .
i	=	i in <i>police</i> .
u	=	u in <i>rude</i> .
æ œ	}	= ea in <i>measure</i> .
au	=	ow in <i>how</i> .

c	{	= c in <i>can</i> , before a, o, u, h.
	{	= ch in <i>check</i> , before e, i, æ, œ.
g	{	= g in <i>got</i> , before a, o, u.
	{	= g in <i>gender</i> , before e, i.
j	=	y, as <i>jam</i> = <i>yam</i> .
sc	{	= sk before a, o, u.
	{	= sh before e, i, æ, œ.

The Italian sound of *o* is, of all the vowel-sounds, the least easy to represent by an equivalent in our own language and the most difficult to acquire in speaking. It is not quite the same as our own and not altogether different. It may perhaps be said to lie between *o* in *on* and *o* in *go*.



## TABLE OF EQUIVALENTS OF LETTERS.

*Greek Pronunciation of Greek.*

$\alpha$	=	<i>a</i> in <i>father</i> .
$\epsilon$	=	<i>e</i> in <i>met</i> .
$\eta$	}	<i>e</i> in <i>me</i> .
$\iota$		
$\upsilon$		
$\alpha\iota$	=	<i>ea</i> in <i>measure</i> .
$\epsilon\iota$	}	{ <i>e</i> in <i>me</i> , or <i>ei</i> in <i>receive</i> .
$\omicron\iota$		
$\upsilon\iota$		
$\omicron\upsilon$	=	<i>ou</i> in <i>soup</i> .
<hr/>		
$\beta$	=	<i>v</i> as $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ = <i>vallo</i> .
$\gamma$	}	<i>gh</i> before $\alpha, \omicron, \omega$ (a slender <i>g</i> aspirated). <i>y</i> before $\epsilon, \eta, \iota, \upsilon$ , as $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ = <i>yenos</i> .
$\delta$		
$\theta$	=	<i>th</i> in <i>this</i> .
$\theta$	=	<i>th</i> in <i>thistle</i> .
$\zeta$	=	<i>z</i> in <i>zeal</i> .
$\chi$	=	<i>ch</i> in the Scotch <i>loch</i> (a guttural <i>h</i> ).
$v$ after	{	<i>v</i> , before vowels and before $\beta, \gamma, \delta, \lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho,$ $\zeta$ , as $\alpha\upsilon\lambda\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ = <i>avlos</i> . <i>f</i> , before $\theta, \kappa, \xi, \pi, \sigma, \tau, \phi, \chi, \psi$ , as $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ = <i>aftos</i> .
$\alpha, \epsilon, \eta,$		
$\omega$		
$\mu\pi$	=	<i>b</i> , as $\acute{\alpha}\mu\pi\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ = <i>ambelos</i> .
$\nu\tau$	=	<i>d</i> , as $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ = <i>leondes</i> .

$\omicron$  and  $\omega$  are pronounced with very little distinction as to quality of sound, and more nearly resemble the Italian *o* than our own.



100.786

LONDON:

PRINTED BY EDWARD STANFORD, 55, CHARING CROSS, S.W.



